

dour the temples which had been destroyed by the Persians, and the riches they had left behind them placed the most ample means at the disposal of the rulers of Athens. Sculpture was influenced by the new impulse which architecture then received. In the centuries before Ageladas, Myron, and Phidias, sculpture attempted little beyond representing, in the simplest way, sacred personages, or subjects illustrative of natural history. But a new light now burst upon the artists' world. Beauty in its sublimest and most seductive forms came to be considered a property of art, and essential to it: and the stimulus afforded by the political events alluded to was attended by a new feature in the practice of sculpture. It was to be borne in mind that much of the sculpture required was for the decoration of the temples; and whilst so employed, it maintained its peculiar character of excellence. That this was the most zealously guarded, even after the great improvements in form effected by Phidias and others, appeared in the history of Phidias himself. Every subsequent deviation from the strictness with which the art was to be practised, as an accessory to religion, seemed to have led to its loss of high character; and perhaps it was not going too far to say that the decline of the grand style in sculpture might have been owing, in a measure, to the appeal made to the senses by Praxiteles and his followers. The introduction of sculpture in the earlier ages of Christianity was owing almost, if not entirely, to the same causes as its birth in the ancient world. At first it was used as a kind of record or representation of events and personages connected with sacred history. In the next stage, mediæval art began to interest the more as it advanced towards beauty. The development of beautiful forms with the Greeks was in the spirit of the age and their religion; but it was in the manner of carrying it out that was seen the distinction between the character and habits of the two periods and different races. After noticing the characteristics of these periods, the author stated that the chief cause of the failure of ecclesiastical and modern sculpture was attributable to the very circumstances that might have assisted in advancing modern art, viz., the taste, among the superior classes of Italy, for everything connected with Grecian associations. The canon of excellence in art was some uncovered statue of antiquity; and, if perchance any sacred subject was illustrated, it was required to be done according to some approved remnant of heathen imagery. Thus was the art that was advancing, and would have advanced, thrust recklessly aside. It no longer was identified with the age, with the people nor with their religion. The charm which had given it life, and which alone could give life to art, was dispelled just at the moment when there appeared every probability that a great and grand step of original (Christian) sculpture would be developed and matured. The genius of Michael Angelo himself was trammelled and enchained by this unfortunate mixture of the ancient and modern; and the artist of the most mighty ability of any age had left works stamped indeed with the seal of the powers of invention, imagination, and technical knowledge, but too often disfigured by mannerism, the result of this attempted combination. From that time no school of fine sculpture had been seen; occasionally successful, nay, most admirable imitations of the statues of the ancients had appeared; but no enduring system had been, or could be, founded upon such false premises as attempting to produce Greek results without Greek associations.

CLIFFORD'S TOWER, YORK.

The Rev. C. H. Hartshorne read a paper on Clifford's Tower. This ancient military building (which is now surrounded by the walls of York Castle) is built of magnesian limestone, the masonry being rather larger than the Norman ashlar. In form it is perfectly in geometrical proportion, and its width each way is about fifty feet. The mound on which it stands is anterior to William the Conqueror, and the date of the tower he believed to be about 1220. The entrance is of later erection; and the arms which surround the door and the jambs of the doorway are still more recent. The name of Clifford was not in connection with the town till the time of Charles II. Mr. Hartshorne

described it as a valuable example of a military building.

STOW CHURCH, LINCOLNSHIRE.

A short description of this church was read by Sir Charles Anderson, Bart. The nave is of early Norman character, and the tower arches of the same style remain, with the perpendicular arches of the present tower interspersed within them; a part of the transepts belongs to a still earlier structure, which has evidently been destroyed by fire. Sir Charles Anderson considered the tower arches to be those of the tower built to receive the bells reported to have been given by Archbishop Putta in 1023, and the transepts to the church burnt by the Danes a few years previous to that time. It is recorded that Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln, rebuilt the church, but Sir Charles considers this only a partial work, and that parts of the older structures still remain.

The Marquis of Northampton remarked that he had never heard better evidence that a part of the church is Saxon; and the Institute was much indebted to Sir Chas. Anderson for adding another good example to the test, perhaps the best, sustained by historical evidence combined with architectural character, of any that had been brought forward.

Professor Willis observed that he was most anxious to do away with the impression, that because in our cathedrals and larger collegiate churches the Norman builders had destroyed every vestige of the Saxon work where they rebuilt the churches, therefore no Saxon buildings exist. On the contrary, he considered it extremely probable, and almost certain, that in our remote country parishes where no funds were forthcoming for building new churches, considerable parts of the original ones still exist. He pointed out the characteristic marks, such as long and short work, and other features by which such buildings may be distinguished.

THE WINDOW IN ST. JAMES'S CHURCH.

Sir.—As you published in your last number a letter addressed to you from Mr. Warrington, one of the artists invited by the committee last year to send in a design for the stained and painted-glass window at St. James's Church, I, as the honorary secretary to that committee, cannot refrain from troubling you with a few remarks, with the view of removing the unfavourable impression which such assertions as are therein contained, if not refuted and contradicted, may make in the minds of yourself and the readers of your excellent journal; they tend to throw an undeserved slur on the conduct of fifty noble men and gentlemen, utterly incapable of acting as a body in the way described by Mr. Warrington, and whose only and most anxious desire was by their liberality and gratuitous services to effect the object for which they were appointed with strict integrity, to obtain a design worthy of the church, and to select from those submitted to them the one which in their judgment they considered the most appropriate, and prove the most satisfactory to the general body of the subscribers.

If, unfortunately, individuals of the general body, by any mistaken zeal to obtain that object, induced any one of the artists to adopt for his design a subject which was ultimately rejected, no one can regret it more than myself; but I most positively affirm, on behalf of the committee as a body, that the competition was most fairly and honourably conducted.

The circular written to the artists who were invited to compete, did not set forth that the window was to be wholly pictorial, it only stipulated that it was "to be designed in keeping with the interior, which is considered one of the finest specimens of Sir Christopher Wren's abilities." The several artists, therefore, were at perfect liberty to adopt any subject or character for their design, so long as that principle was adhered to.

Five designs were sent in to the committee, and the competitors who chose to attend the meeting had the opportunity of doing so, to explain or make any statement which they might wish relative to the character or subject which they had individually adopted; their several designs were carefully investigated; their merits discussed; and it was the general opinion at a large meeting of the committee, that the mosaic style and character adopted in

the design sent in by Mr. Wailes, was the most appropriate for the window.

In execution of the work, Mr. Wailes, by the request of the committee, most certainly altered the architectural details, but the pictorial subjects selected by him, and the mosaic style and character of his design are retained; therefore, as mosaics are certainly any thing but inappropriate to Italian architecture, and as architectural errors in artists' designs are often to be found, I do not think that the whole merit of a plan should be condemned or thrown aside because a committee may require its details to be corrected. And I cannot see that the committee in this instance, as Mr. Warrington has stated, decided "upon a design which they were evidently shamed out of, and induced an open violation of their own specified conditions;" or "that it was a direct breach of integrity in a man-called competition in the selection of a design which could by no possibility be adopted." I must assert, in justice to the artist, that the design in all its essential parts has been carried out, and with much credit to himself.

Mr. Warrington further intimates, that the committee have made statements through the press: this I deny; whatever may have been said on the subject by way of criticism, has entirely originated with themselves.

Thus far I have considered it my duty as honorary secretary to the committee, and without consulting them on the subject, to defend them in their proceedings, which I again aver, in my opinion, were honourable and straightforward. Whether their decision has displayed "negative wisdom" or no, is another question, and in my mind a difficult one to decide. The work as executed has been much admired, and been pronounced to possess considerable merit, with which opinion I most certainly concur, although I must confess I should prefer a pictorial production of "an Angelo, a Raffaele, or a Rubens." But, unfortunately for us, talents such as they possessed are rarely or ever met with; the soul and feeling introduced into their pictures by their hitherto inimitable touch, are too often lost in a copy—which is only a copy after all. If first-rate talent be not employed in a picture, whether it be on glass or canvas, it generally raises a feeling of regret at the labour in vain. It therefore becomes a serious matter for consideration whether, in so large a work, a copy of one of their pictures or an original of talent inferior to theirs—taking into account the disagreeable effects always produced by the junction of the glass and the lines of the iron-work necessary to support the window,—would have been the more appropriate style to adopt. Wiser heads than mine, on this occasion, said nay, therefore I felt bound to succumb; but I still am most decidedly anxious that the artists in glass painting may eventually so improve in the art, as to overcome all the difficulties they have at present to contend with, and I do most sincerely hope, that more charitable feelings may be exhibited for the future, from your correspondent towards any one who may hereafter be his fellow competitor; for although I had no personal knowledge of Mr. Wailes or Mr. Warrington prior to this work being executed, I think it right to bear testimony to the gentlemanly behaviour of the former, and although, as I before stated, I am still inclined to the truly pictorial, I am quite persuaded that such wholesale and unmerited expressions of condemnation of a fellow artist's work, will neither do good to the cause or add weight to the arguments of the latter, or gain for him the good opinion of the multitude, without which a professional man generally sinks into insignificance. I shall now leave this matter in the hands of Mr. Wailes, if he think well to notice Mr. Warrington's letter, and trust to my reputation for you (and your readers, if you will kindly allow it space in your journal) believing my statement. Apologizing to you, Sir, for thus intruding on your valuable time,

I am, Sir, &c. CHARLES MAYHEW.
14, Argyll-street, July 26th, 1846.

PREMIUM FOR THE PRESERVATION OF MONUMENTS.—On the suggestion of the French Committee of Historical Monuments, the Minister of the Interior has caused a medal to be struck, to be presented to those who have lent to his administration valuable assistance in the preservation of national monuments.